

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 116 765

JC 760 087

AUTHOR Howard, Grover A.
TITLE The Exploratory College.
INSTITUTION Rio Hondo Junior Coll., Whittier, Calif.
NOTE 38p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.76 HC-\$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Core Curriculum; *Educational Alternatives;
*Experimental Colleges; *Humanistic Education;
Humanities; *Interdisciplinary Approach; *Junior
Colleges; Program Development; Relevance
(Education)

ABSTRACT

This document describes the evolution of the Exploratory College at Rio Hondo Junior College (Whittier, California) from its inception at a faculty retreat in 1970 through its first year of operation in 1972-73. The Exploratory College was designed as an alternative center for exploring new ways of learning within the college community. By being a smaller, primarily interdisciplinary nucleus, it reflects the need for modes of experience that are more commensurate with individual and group goals than is traditionally possible. Goals of the Exploratory College include: (1) the creation of a center for exploring new ways of learning; (2) the creation of a relaxed learning setting with flexible scheduling; (3) the provision of guidance in the determination of personal and professional goals; (4) an increase in the self-awareness of students and faculty; (5) the perception of the interrelatedness of various academic disciplines; (6) involvement in the community as an integral part of the learning environment; (7) the provision of standard college credit within a non-threatening grading system; (8) the development of personal values and attitudes through exposure to the values and attitudes of different cultures. A general student evaluation is appended, along with a list of goals and specific objectives. (Author/NHM)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED 116702

THE EXPLORATORY COLLEGE

by

Grover A. Howard

Rio Hondo College
Whittier, California

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

RIO HONDO COLLEGE
Whittier, California

THE EXPLORATORY COLLEGE

The Exploratory College, like most attempts at educational innovation or reforms, arose as a reaction to the larger forces challenging the established institutions of society. In the 1960's, American social movements used the campus as a place where protest could be focused. Soon the schools themselves became the target. Students attacked the educational structure for being too bureaucratic, too impersonal, too isolated from the realities of the day. The ideal function of the university for these students was to educate thinking, feeling individuals. Schools had become a perversion of this ideal; instead of a humanistic educational system, students felt that college had become "degree factories", which merely stamped out an endless stream of replaceable cogs for the industrial complex. Their newly-awakened social consciousness demanded that the educational process be "relevant" to both society's problems and their own personal needs.

Rio Hondo felt this surge of concern a little later than most institutions of higher learning, perhaps because of the predominately conservative community which the college served. What was unusual in the Rio Hondo experience was that the initiation of educational reform came not from the student body, but from the Board of Trustees, the administration and the faculty of the college. One reason for this stems from the fact that community college students are, for the most part, career oriented and attend the institution for a shorter time than their counterparts in the four-year colleges and universities. Thus, as has been frequently stated, community college students have less of a stake in curriculum changes. Furthermore, Rio Hondo was a young college, with a new president and faculty, and thus had not fully developed the bureaucratic rigidification of older, more established institutions.

In the spirit, of the times, newly-selected President Walter Garcia in 1967 proposed an annual retreat for the college's faculty, administration and Board as a medium for increasing communication among these three segments of the campus community. One of the key recommendations of the first FAB retreat (January, 1968) was to establish a President's Select Commission on Curriculum and Instruction. The FAB report to the Board described the purpose of the Commission:

Emphasis in the study will be based on the FAB Committee recommendations related to small group sessions, remedial classes and labs, accelerated classes and labs, innovations in teaching, interdisciplinary courses, the use of media in instruction, and future planning of physical facilities to accommodate innovation. The Committee felt that action in curriculum and instruction should be based on sound research and on studies of programs already functioning throughout the state and nation.

The President appointed a committee consisting of Robert Becker (Business), Tom Miller (Social Science), Yoshio Nakamura (Fine Arts), Robert Negus (Engineering-Mathematics), Ted Rankin (Police Science), and Orlen Willoughby (Counseling). Miller was chosen as the committee's first chairman. Garcia began the endeavor with great enthusiasm and promise of support:

I am recommending to the Board of Trustees that we establish a research development fund in our budget and at least several thousand dollars be allocated for this fund for the coming budget year. Funds in this budget account may be used for travel by the members of the Commission, for the purchase of materials, publications, and for the employment of substitutes for these members of the Commission who will need to be doing some traveling. Additionally, the college will provide secretarial support for the work of the Commission and we will want, I think, at our first meeting to explore other matters of logistic support for the work of the Commission. Although I cannot make a firm commitment at this time, it will be my intention to seek to reduce the teaching load of the members of the Commission at least for the spring semester.

The purpose of the committee, according to Garcia, was to "address itself to ways in which we might keep our instructional techniques, or instructional approaches, our instructional program, current, valid, and to use the word proper at that time, 'relevant'."

During the first year of its existence (1968-69), the committee struggled with the elusive task of building "relevancy" and innovation into the instructional program. Garcia realized that "it was particularly difficult during its (the Select Commission's) first year to fasten on a role that would be productive." The main direction of the commission was to strive to upgrade instruction by providing incentives for instructors to expand their techniques and abilities. By far the most significant accomplishment of the commission was the Instructional Development Grant Program. The commission also established the Distinguished Faculty Lecture series, which honored "outstanding" faculty members through a campus-wide lecture program, with a small honorarium given to the selected faculty member.

Garcia felt that "on balance the Select Commission was not a holding success, but there were certain rather positive things which came out of it." Aside for the Instructional Development Grant program, which he felt was of paramount importance, the commission's discussions indicated to him that "there were at least some people on the faculty who were sufficiently introspective about the instructional processes that went on at the college that we would be able to tackle the problem of teaching and learning in alternative styles and fashions."

During 1969-70, Garcia hoped that the commission would turn its attention to "more fundamental strategies in improvement of instruction." However, such an undertaking required more energy and time than the commission members could afford, given the demands of their regular teaching loads. Garcia, therefore, proposed an intensive two-day workshop for commission members, administrative staff, department chairmen, and Board members. Professor Arthur Cohen of U.C.L.A. was employed as a consultant for the session, which was held at Highland Springs, January 26-27, 1970.

Cohen's role, as Garcia saw it, was not to sell the college a "package plan" but to prod the staff to think about possible approaches to instructional innovation which would fit into the Rio Hondo environment. However, it was obvious that Cohen greatly influenced the conclusions arrived at by the twenty-four participants.

General accord was reached on two main items:

1. Instructional objectives are needed for each of the courses now offered by the college.
2. The college should embark on a serious study of an "Exploratory Year" for entering freshmen.

The annual report of the Commission to the board, presented by Chairman Robert Negus, expanded the "Exploratory Year" concept:

As envisioned in the discussion so far, the Exploratory Year entails many new approaches to courses and student activity. At the outset the students would be given a thorough orientation to college, an introduction to the different departments and the facilities and activities of the college. We are already starting a similar program next fall under the direction of the counseling staff. Aptitude tests, personal interviews, etc. would begin to reveal the student's capabilities and aspirations. During or immediately following the tests and interviews, the student would take a series of short, intensive, survey courses of all the fields of study in the college. The intent here is to give the student a look at the various fields without requiring a full semester's commitment. Some regard these courses as an opportunity for the instructors in the various disciplines to recruit promising students into their programs. The net result is intended to be an overview for each student of what the college can offer him.

A second aspect of the Exploratory Year is intended to develop a sense of responsibility in the student and an awareness of his role in the community. As part of his college program he would perform some type of community service. Some of the activities so far suggested are tutoring in the elementary or secondary schools, social work, work in one of the public agencies, or serving as a teacher-aide. In addition, there would be available apprenticeships or internships in various occupations so that the student could explore different vocational possibilities. An opportunity would be provided for students to do independent study under the guidance of an instructor in one or more of the academic disciplines. Travel, under specified circumstances, would be encouraged.

A third phase of the program would provide remedial studies to remove academic deficiencies, and courses to meet the health education and government requirements.

The Exploratory Year program obviously departs markedly from the traditional community college study program. The Commission feels that our college is being called upon to perform functions that depart markedly from the traditional role of an "institution of higher learning."

Differences in educational philosophy and methodology created natural disagreements over the concept of an Exploratory Year. Many faculty members, in Garcia's words, "were more concerned with preserving what they regarded as academic standards." This strong opposition, which Garcia called "not altogether unreasonable or irrational," were centered in powerful and prestigious individuals, ranging from the then Vice President of Academic Affairs, Morris Bergen, to department chairmen and many of the faculty. However, Garcia felt that there was "sufficient interest in the Exploratory Year... that I felt encouraged enough to pursue it further."

Among those who agreed upon the concept of an Exploratory Year, there was also disagreement over what the main thrusts of the experiment should be. These differences continued even after the Exploratory College had been founded.

One area of controversy stemmed from concern over those students who were undecided about their future careers. It was the feeling of many at Highland Springs that an Exploratory Year could aid a student in his choice-making by offering a smorgasbord of subjects in a shorter time-span. Thus a student could experiment, without "wasting" time, and arrive at a career objective. However, others on the campus felt strongly that the work-world that these students would enter would be so rapidly changing that the notion of a one-career life was simply unrealistic. It was far better, they felt, to teach the student to "learn how to learn" through an innovative, interdisciplinary program. Students would then be better equipped to face changes in work and life-styles that they would be certain to face.

A second area of dispute arose over the concept that the Exploratory Year's curriculum ought to be directly related to the immediate community. Cohen, in his book, Dateline '79: Heretical Concepts for the Community College, had emphasized this point and it was thoroughly considered by the Highland Springs group. Cohen believed that the campus could no longer be isolated from the community it served

and must begin at once to center its curriculum in the surrounding reality. Others, such as Board Member Richard Myers, extended this idea to include community service functions which would be provided by students as part of their program of study. These two concepts were both attempting to make education more "relevant" by giving the student credit for practical life experiences, a notion which was becoming very popular at the time.

Finally, there were also differences of opinion over the nature of the subject matter to be taught. One group felt that the Exploratory Year would be primarily for remedial studies. Others, believing that "remedial courses usually don't remedy anything," stated that it was far better to take a cross-section of the student body and offer them an alternative approach to education. These students, who had been frustrated by the traditional program, would be then stimulated to achieve more rapidly.

Such philosophical and methodological differences would be hammered out by a committee during the year 1970-71, according to the Negus report. Then, during the next year, a full-time director would be selected to guide the actual planning of the program. In line with the recommendations, a committee consisting of Jim Albanese, Lee Schwartz, and Miller was appointed, with Dr. Joseph Michaels serving as chairman. Board Member Myers, the sole Trustee to attend the Highland Springs meeting, was asked to also serve as a member.

The committee immediately began to seek financial support from a number of private foundations. Michaels drew up a proposal and sent applications to: the Ford Foundation (October 5, 1970); the Esso Foundation (October 16, 1970); the Carnegie Corporation (December 9, 1970); the Kellogg Foundation (December 29, 1970); the Sloan Foundation (January 12, 1971); and the United States Office of Education (January 21, 1971). Although the applications were well-reasoned and tightly organized, none was successful. Rejections were based generally on the fact that the particular foundation either did not fund such projects or that they were already funding too many of them.

The purpose of an Exploratory College (as it was now being called) was, according to Michaels, to provide an education which would meet the demands of the changing world. "Students have discovered," he continued, "that the curriculum, in all too many institutions, is shaped far more often by faculty compromise than by brilliant insight into the nature of a free society. Our urban student asserts that education appears to be unchanging and irrelevant. In essence the college curriculum needs to be shaped to assist students to deal with the here and now, including the many perplexities of their political, social and economic lives."

Michaels outlined the basic objectives of an Exploratory College:

1. Re-assess our current educational philosophies and practices.
2. Recommend alternate approaches to general education requirements.
3. Develop an exploratory first year for students to provide urgently needed opportunities for them to explore and to identify their basic interests and skills and to crystalize their educational objectives.
4. Implement extensive modifications of our student 'recruitment' induction and orientation programs which our staff envisions.
5. Provide opportunities for students to 'test out' courses in abbreviated periods of time.
6. Develop a number of 'mini-courses'.
7. Assign students to a variety of public and private service agencies so they may obtain realistic community service experiences.
8. Develop new "exploratory" college courses.
9. Re-design existing listening facilities in the Language Laboratory and student carrels in the Library for a new, viable system for independent study.
10. Develop opportunities for relevant work experience for students in a variety of vocational fields.

To accomplish these objectives, Michaels created a model of an Exploratory College:

A separate and distinct Exploratory College involving approximately 400 to 500 students initially is envisioned by the task force....

Our 2-semester academic year of 36 weeks will be divided into four 9-week periods. Each 9-week block will have a uniform 3-week module for mini-structured courses or activities.

Three of the four mini-week blocks will be scheduled for academic studies. The fourth 9-week block will be devoted to the community service and/or study-related work experiences. Flexibility in the community service and study-related work experience block will be provided.

The academic program will be essentially concerned with general education, providing transfer credit for each student who will be given the opportunity to repeat courses until he has successfully mastered the content...

Tentative titles for the nine-week academic blocks are: "Professional Studies," "Technical Studies," "Liberal Studies," and "Internship Program."

Michaels divided the curriculum in the following fashion:

Professional Studies	Technical Studies
Creative Arts	Mathematics
Business Education	Engineering
Police Science	Languages
Pre-Law	Physical Science
Biological Sciences	Physical Education
Liberal Studies	Internship
Communications	Community Service
Psychology	Study-related work experience
Humanities	
Social Science	

Rio Hondo reaction to the Michaels proposal was somewhat mixed. An abstract of his plan was circulated among the faculty on January 8, 1971, as a prelude to the discussions to be held at the upcoming FAB retreat, where Michaels would make a multi-media presentation. In general, response was very enthusiastic about his ideas. But there was some concern expressed, what Garcia later called a "defensive reaction." "If you say there are alternative ways of educating that we ought to explore, to some people that's interpreted as saying 'you don't like the way I'm performing'," Garcia explained. Cohen also responded to the Michaels plan by warning that any valid experiment must be composed of a cross-section of the student body. Although generally enthusiastic, Cohen expressed a concern which was often repeated, by Garcia, "It doesn't go far enough."

Included in the Michaels proposal was a budget of \$78,500 for 1971-72, which increased to \$82,335 for the following year. The first year budget allocated \$20,000 for a director; \$12,000 for a research assistant; \$7,500 for a secretary;

and \$27,000 for faculty release time to aid in curriculum development. Although these figures were somewhat inflated in the tradition of foundation applications, the Board of Trustees was consistently nervous about allocating anything near this amount for the development of an Exploratory College. The position seemed to be that either the college find outside support or initiate the program on a severely reduced scale.

Michaels first presented his outline of the Exploratory College to the Board on March 31, 1971. Unanimously the board approved the concepts described in the Carnegie application, but requested that Michaels draw up a more "realistic" budget. At the meeting on April 28, Michaels offered a budget which dropped the research assistant, but included \$40,800 for curriculum development and \$1,000 for a consultant. The Board eliminated the funds for curriculum development and then approved the remainder of the budget by a three to two vote.

The Board had thus turned the responsibility for the development of the Exploratory College over to a full-time director, to be selected before the fall of 1971. On July 1, announcements for the position were circulated among the staff. Three finalists were interviewed by an administrative committee of Garcia, vice-president Len Grandy, and vice-president Frank Pearce. After much discussion, George Juric, of the Social Science Department, was selected on August 4, 1971.

At this point, many of the individuals who had been instrumental in the development of the Exploratory College concept became much less active, being replaced initially by Pearce and Juric. This shift in personnel foreshadowed a natural and perceptible change in the philosophic direction of the project.

Pearce, who had just assumed his new post in July, brought to Rio Hondo valuable experience from his previous position as vice-president of the College of San Mateo, where he had established an experimental college. He was able to offer many insights into the kinds of problems that Juric might encounter. The main obstacles, Pearce believed, were three-fold. "Number one was obtaining the approval

of the faculty, trying to get them involved in it. That was the one that I had the greatest difficulty with at San Mateo and it was repeated at Rio Hondo." Secondly, he felt that since such experiments did not fit into a college's normal routine, procedural and logistical problems were inevitable. "It didn't fit the mold," he explained. "It didn't fit the way everything else happened, for example in the scheduling of classes or in establishing a budget." Lastly, was the lack of understanding by the Exploratory College founders of the deeper philosophical implications of their proposals. He was worried that much of the Exploratory College's premises were based on unexamined assumptions about educational concepts and methodology.

Although Pearce had inherited from Garcia the major administrative responsibility for the Exploratory College, he decided to give its new director a free-hand during his first semester on the job. Juric began by establishing an advisory committee of 17 faculty members and six students. "My objective in formulating the advisory committee was to gather together those people who showed enthusiasm for the project, who had some background or experience with innovations, and who could contribute to the development of the program from different points of view," he said. The committee began a series of almost weekly meetings, which because of their length, were held oftentimes on week-ends at an off-campus location. The diversity of opinions and the complexity of the issues soon engulfed the group and threatened to immobilize the project by trapping the committee in a quagmire of philosophical and methodological problems. However, consensus on the broad goals gradually emerged.

This refinement of the goals of the Exploratory College was presented to the Board by Juric in his first progress report (November 24, 1971):

Within the broad observations and objectives of the original project proposal the needs and goals of the Exploratory College seem to require the following:

The Exploratory College is not for everyone. Those students who are successful in the traditional program and have some idea what they want and where they are going will do well in spite of

what we do. However, too many of our students do not have direction, are not motivated and do not know their options. These students should be our primary concern.

1. A series of courses to cover the areas of social science, natural science, humanities/fine arts, and occupational education. These would give to the student a year of exploration to help him find himself and to find some direction for his future. The student would also be earning general education credit. Credit by examination should be included in the program.
2. The establishment of a learning skills center to help those students that are in need so that they can profit from this exposure. This center should include reading, writing, spelling speaking, discussing and any other skills necessary to be successful in the students' area of interest. The emphasis should be on helping students without the stigma of having failed.
3. Another supportive service should be in the area of counseling and advisement. The counselors assigned to these students should be especially aware of their difficulties and problems. Diagnostic testing would be part of the service to identify student needs.
4. Underlying the whole program should be a faculty imbued with the idea of success. The goals and objectives of all courses should be clearly identified and understood by the students, and within the students' capabilities. Students may well vary in the length of time it takes to complete the objectives. This should be taken into account in each course. The grading system would also be modified by eliminating D or F or using Credit/No Credit to reflect success instead of fearful failure.
5. The total program should be made flexible in order to accomodate inevitable change. As we gain experience with the program, we may find that as needs of students change the program should be changed.

Also at the meeting, Juric reported that he was in the process of conferring with each department at the college. The purpose of the meetings was: "(1) to acquaint everyone with the proposed development of an Exploratory College as per Board of Trustees action (April 28, 1971) and to give them background information as to the genesis of the program; (2) to learn more about each of the departments, their personnel, and modus operandi; (3) to encourage each department to establish 'exploratory committees' or committees on innovations' within each department as a source of ideas and to promote an atmosphere for

improvement and change." Although Juric believed that these meetings were "generally successful," the demands of his enormous task soon diminished the number of contacts with the faculty. This resulting decline in communications caused, in Garcia's words, "a rise in staff suspiciousness." Pearce felt that this breakdown in communication created serious problems in obtaining the necessary faculty support for the success of the Exploratory College. "Many people were hostile to the concept," he said, "because they just didn't know what the Exploratory College was planning."

These plans were disclosed to the Board in the Juric report. The tentative developmental schedule called for the establishment of the curriculum in January, 1972, staff selection in March, delineation of measurable objectives in May, and finalization of the program in June. Given the scope of the problems, the timetable was rather unrealistic. Pearce readily understood this fact, since the experimental college at San Mateo had taken two years of solid planning, but he was every bit encouraged, at this point, with the sizeable progress that Juric and the committee were making.

The advisory committee continued to meet throughout the fall semester and by January had arrived at a list of basic assumptions about education, which clearly indicated a shift in concerns from those of the Highland Springs group. Juric enumerated these ideas in a report to the Board on March 8, 1972:

1. We do not now meet the needs of all students.
2. The Exploratory College should be made available to any students that feels that he can gain from the experience.
3. Most students do not know themselves or their areas of interest when they begin college.
4. Students should have the opportunity to explore widely the various disciplines of knowledge.
5. Exploration could take place in less time than we presently provide.
6. Learning takes place in varying schedules of time and is not necessarily related to time.
7. Goals and objectives that are clearly understood encourage learning.

8. Learning takes place most when students are motivated by their own goals.
9. Students helping other students is an effective means to promote learning.
10. Student-faculty contact should be a positive factor in motivation and learning.
11. Curiosity is a natural phenomenon and should be encouraged.
12. Education should reflect the rapidity of change in modern society.
13. Human knowledge is interrelated and should be explored that way.
14. Education should unify--not separate--the following:
 - a. Learning and experience
 - b. Past, present and future
 - c. Romance and reality
 - d. Mind and body
 - e. Work, play and contemplation
15. What ever is educationally desirable is administratively possible.

Although the Exploratory College was naturally evolving into different directions than was originally planned, the Board and administration did not object, at that time, and, in fact, seemed rather pleased with the progress that had been achieved. The attitude among those who supported the Exploratory College was that it was an adventurous undertaking based on valid educational concepts. One Board member summed up this attitude by exclaiming at the March meeting, "This could either be a gigantic success or a tremendous bust, but all we can do is to try it."

There were, however, some strong negative reactions from several sectors of the faculty. Don Jenkins, chairman of the Biology Department, exemplified the opposition to the Exploratory College in his letter to the Academic Council on February 21, 1972. Jenkins felt that since "it is apparent that each department and faculty member will be asked to some degree to subsidize this program, we must assume more responsibility to assure its success." Jenkins argued that there were no real objectives in the Juric report, only subjective statements without substantiating data. In his words:

Indeed there is a list of 'basic ideas,' some of which are 'motherhood' proclamations ('Student-faculty contact should be a positive factor in motivation and learning'); some are

fact ('We do not now meet the needs of all students'); some are gobbledygook ('Most students do not know themselves'); none are used to generate an hypothesis regarding how the 'Exploratory College' will improve the education of students at Rio Hondo. In addition, one finds contradiction among these 'basic ideas,' such as, 'The Exploratory College should be made available to any student who feels that he can gain from the experience' and 'Most students do not know themselves or their areas of interest when they begin college.' If students don't know themselves, how would they know whether they would 'gain' from the Exploratory College? What I find lacking are data that could be used to formulate the hypothesis. Inasmuch as Department Chairmen are primarily responsible for the personnel and curriculum of the college, it is my strong conviction that we must become involved in the Exploratory College to the extent we are assured that the same standards are met in its development that would be required in any other curricula. Certainly a statement of objectives and identification of the student population for which the program is being developed is a minimal requirement at this time.

Increased departmental involvement never materialized. Instead there seemed to be a growing polarization on the campus which undoubtedly had a significant effect on Juric's attempt to recruit staff for the Exploratory College.

Originally, the advisory committee had projected a target student enrollment of 150, with four full-time faculty members from the areas of communications, social science, natural science, and humanities/fine arts. These four would be augmented by a full-time director and part-time instructors from physical education and occupational education. However, the announcement of staff openings was not well received by the faculty and only eight instructors applied. Aside from those who opposed the Exploratory College, staff reluctance was attributed by Pearce to the fact that "either they didn't know what they would be getting into, or they did and didn't like the tremendous amount of work that such an endeavor would require." Unfortunately, the scope of the applicants considerably narrowed the potential program of the Exploratory College. Most importantly there were no applicants from any of the Rio Hondo science departments. The original staff, selected on March 15, consisted of Susan Obler (communications, 100% assignment), Bill Bayer (fine arts, 80%), Grover Howard (social science, 60%), Ken Knowlton

(occupational education, 60%), Dave Beveridge (physical education, 50%), and Ken Bos (physical education, 35%). Juric was given 20% release time for his duties as director, the remainder to be spent in Exploratory College instruction. As those involved soon learned, the percentage breakdown of teaching load bore little resemblance to the realities of their new duties. This led to a continuous campaign by the Exploratory staff for full-time instructors, a goal which was finally achieved in the fall of 1974.

Administrative and Board support began to wane somewhat when the always sticky question of financial support surfaced. Pearce noted, in his preface to Juric's March report, that "it seems quite clear that initial gross expenses for operating the program will be somewhat above the average operational costs. However, we expect the program to provide a model representing another alternative to student learning and comparative costs will be necessary for such a model to be effective." Although the Board endorsed Pearce's statement it refused to make a definite commitment for funds. The result was, as Pearce later remarked, "for all practical purposes, we took money from just about every pocket we could find rather than put up the necessary seed money." Such actions noticeably affected the development of the Exploratory College. The attitude within the advisory committee was that it was treading on uncertain ground, not quite sure of how far it could go in formulating an experimental program. Always present was their fear that all of their efforts might be futile if an institutional financial commitment never came. Also, departmental hostility, already growing because of the reduction of communication from the advisory committee, increased as chairmen saw their funds being potentially channeled to this new project.

One such problem arose in April, 1972, when Juric requested that the Board hire as consultants the staff members of the Exploratory College. Juric had encountered a serious time-squeeze in trying to meet his ambitious schedule for development. He therefore asked that the Board compensate the new staff for the consider-

able time which would be required for their completion of preparations of the opening of the college in September. The administration balked at recommending direct funding of the request and instead utilized Proyecto Adelante money. Proyecto Adelante was in the process of applying for a grant to subsidize consultants for the development of a "learning skills center." Since this had been part of the original Exploratory College plans, the administration sought to couple the two requests. This action was vigorously opposed by the Adelante advisory committee and E.O.P. Director Sylvia Harinck, because there was no relationship, they argued, between what the Exploratory College was doing and the problems of the culturally-deprived students. Faced with strong administrative pressure, Adelante finally agreed, but only after successfully removing from the proposal the two physical education instructors, who would have to be paid through district funds. Adelante's new position was explained in its application: "Although the Exploratory College concept was not developed initially with Adelante students in mind, the relevance of the concept for such students is apparent to the college staff and (Adelante) Advisory Committee." The document goes on to say that the Exploratory College, as an alternative to the traditional program at Rio Hondo, "should offer the Adelante student a particularly rich and meaningful educational experience." Thus, in order to avoid a budgetary confrontation, the Exploratory College was now saddled with an implied commitment to help alleviate the unique problems of the Adelante students.

Another similar incident occurred the following month when Garcia proposed that the Exploratory College staff be employed during the summer in order to finalize the program and that their salaries be funded through the Instructional Development Grant Program. Given the widespread interest in these funds, there were, of course, loud protests. Garcia explained his action in a letter to the faculty on May 31, but it appeared to only slightly mollify the Exploratory College's opponents.

By the end of the spring semester, 1972, the Exploratory College staff felt that it had only pockets of support among the faculty with the only strong administrative backing coming from Garcia and Pearce. The Board seemed to have adopted a "wait and see" attitude. Operating in this atmosphere of rising opposition became increasingly difficult for Juric and his staff. Their response was to become more reclusive. They were faced with the pressure of the approaching deadlines and thus became almost totally occupied with the job of opening the Exploratory College in September. However demanding they felt this task-at-hand, this further isolation did nothing to reduce faculty suspicion and ignorance of the program.

Further problems were met by the Exploratory College staff when it began drawing up plans for a practical format. As Pearce had foreseen, experimental ideas and procedures are not readily accommodated in a traditional educational system. One of the first obstacles encountered was that of physical facilities. The Exploratory College staff considered it essential to have a facility which would enhance the students' feeling of "community" and could, at the same time, be flexible enough to handle both large and small group sessions. Fortunately, the Exploratory College was able to occupy a room on the fourth floor of the library building, space which was formerly used as a warehouse. Although the facility was nearly ideal for its purposes, the Exploratory College did create further negative feelings by encroaching upon space that the library staff was planning for future use. The room was to be painted, carpeted, and furnished with desks, chairs, and moveable partitions. But on the first day of the fall semester, incoming students entered a barren room with concrete floors. The spirit of experimentation carried them and the faculty through the first few weeks while the room was belatedly being equipped.

A striking success of the spring and summer planning sessions was the improved ability of the Exploratory College staff to work together. Obler skill-

fully led the group through a series of exercises which were designed to expand interpersonal communication and develop group cohesiveness. While differences did occur, the heightened communication had great payoffs in the intensive, almost daily staff meetings during the fall as well as in the faculty's increased ability to engage in small group discussions.

By June, the staff had developed a more concrete plan, which was described to the Board in a report on June 28 (see attachment #1). The year would begin with a four-week orientation program which was designed to: (1) identify students' goals, interests, and abilities; (2) develop skills in interpersonal communication; (3) acquaint students with the learning resources of both their campus and community. Orientation was followed by a ten-week session in which individual courses were to be held. Concluding the semester was a four-week module, called the "Interim," in which students were to either complete their course work or engage in independent study. In the second semester, it was planned to conduct two seven-week modules for individual courses and one four-week session, the "Transitional," which was to be similar to the "Interim,"

Although it was not noted by either the administration or the Board, Juric's report indicated a further evolution of the goals of the Exploratory College. The most significant change was the diminution of the role of the "community-based curriculum." Juric did state that the faculty would "Determine the utilization and involvement of guest speakers and resource people from the faculty and the community," and would "Prepare for the community involvement experiences that will benefit students in their specific area of responsibility "; however, this was not nearly to the extent that either Cohen or Myers had perceived as being necessary for a truly community-based program.

A more subtle change was signaled by the report's failure to mention methods of preparing students for career-choices, other than in the orientation module. The Exploratory College staff did not feel that this goal was unimportant, only that it would perhaps be better attained through interdisciplinary courses and

innovative instruction rather than through the Michaels plan of giving students a sampling of subjects. Instead of concentrating on the undecided student, the Exploratory College aimed to reach those who sought an alternative approach to education.

Another shift occurred with the almost complete elimination of the remedial aspect of its program. Just two months earlier, the Proyecto Adelante application stated that the "Exploratory College has also indicated a commitment to meet the needs of the high percentage of students on probation on this campus..." What the Proyecto Adelante committee saw as a promise for remedial education was rather an attempt by the Exploratory College staff to "turn on" underachievers through an innovative program. Even the Learning Skills Center, which germinated in part in early Exploratory College discussions, was relegated to others and was never fully incorporated into the Exploratory College program.

These alterations in the original goals and objectives of the Exploratory College were part its evolutionary growth, which assumed different directions naturally as different personnel participated and new problems were encountered. The Exploratory College was not omitting any of its original aims; it was rather slightly redirecting the main thrusts of its program. Importantly, these changes were announced. Although communication from the Exploratory College could have been greatly improved, faculty, administrative, and Board confusion over these philosophic changes were mostly a result of their lack of attention to the clearly explanatory reports which were frequently provided. It should also be noted that some acknowledged the direction the Exploratory College was taking but still felt that it was pursuing valid educational objectives. Garcia later remarked that "we may have come up with a vehicle which solves a different set of problems than those we originally were concentrating on." He saw the day when an institution might have several exploratory colleges, each with a slightly different focus.

To achieve the goal of 150 students for the fall semester, Juric began an energetic recruitment campaign both on campus and in the community. Ted Snyder aided these efforts by designing an attractive brochure and by informing the community of the project in the local papers.

The criteria for admission became a nagging problem for the Exploratory College staff. It was finally decided that interest in the program would be the only requirement. Juric and his staff personally interviewed applicants and informed them of the scope of the program. Out of a total of 226 applications received, 167 students actually enrolled for the first semester. Although there was no conscious attempt to obtain a microcosm of the Rio Hondo student body, a demographic survey of the first class portrayed a fairly accurate cross-section of the student population at the college. Interestingly, continuing students (98) made up the bulk of the group.

Registration of Exploratory students proved to be far more difficult than recruiting and enrolling them. Flexibility was a prime concern of the Exploratory College but not of the Rio Hondo Admissions office. Believing that students learn at different rates, the Exploratory College attempted to provide ways for students to complete their course objectives at their own pace. Moreover, the students were to make up their program of study after the four-week orientation and were allowed to change that program during the semester as their interests changed. Such a system created chaos in the normal routine of the Admissions Office and was immediately and strongly objected to by them. Thus the Exploratory College staff, in the midst of trying to launch an experiment, found itself bogged down by administrative technicalities. Only through the sympathetic intervention of Pearce and Garcia were the issues finally resolved.

Another problem was met when the Exploratory College attempted to give credit for classes. Since regulations limited the awarding of units to only those courses which had been already approved by the Board, the Exploratory College

was limited to courses which were in the college catalog, each with a fairly definitive list of objectives. This greatly reduced the staff's ability to offer truly experimental courses. As a recourse, they sought to present the traditional subjects through a different approach. This departure from established ways was criticized by some faculty members, who felt that their "domain" was being infringed upon and that their standards were being compromised.

The first such confrontation came when the Exploratory College sought to give students credit for the orientation program. Juric believed that it was educationally valid to give students some kind of credit for what was obviously a learning experience. He finally proposed to give them credit for Psychology for Self Appraisal (20), much to the consternation of the counseling staff who had originated and traditionally taught the course. Through extensive discussion and compromise, aided by light-handed administrative pressure, the issue was finally smoothed. The Exploratory College thereafter enjoyed generally good relations with the counsellors, who helped the program on numerous occasions.

The original orientation schedule was based on four weekly themes:

WEEK I

WHERE WE ARE

Introduction-Group Dynamics
 People to People
 Faculty & Students
Past Experience
General Overview
 Exploratory College
Exploration
 Self
 Campus
 Community
Who am I?
What am I Doing?
Where am I going?

WEEK II

WHAT WE NEED

Tests-Self Appraisal
Evaluation-Exploration
 Aptitude
 Achievement
 Interest
 Skills
Intro-Techniques
 Discussions
 Panel
 Seminars
 Projects
 Contracts
Methods of Evaluation
Grading System

WEEK III

WHAT'S AVAILABLE

Campus Exploration
Physical Education
Humanities/Fine Arts
Vocational Technical
Natural Science
Social Science
Exploratory College Spectrum
Humanities/Fine Arts
Communications
Physical Education
Social Science
Technology
Sociogram
Alternative Methods
Teaching v. Learning

WEEK IV

WHAT'S AHEAD

Contracts
Groups
Tutors
Faculty Advisors
Focus of Interests
Individual Commitment
Values - Quality
Individual Responsibility
Security

Also included in the orientation program was a presentation by Ed Muraski, Director of the Cooperative Education program. This was an effort by the staff to expand its program to the community in some fashion. However, the attempt was only moderately successful due to Muraski's and the staff's limited follow-through and the students' lack of interest.

The excitement of the new venture stirred the faculty and students, making them disregard the considerable chaos surrounding the first few weeks. Although the testing program was not as thorough as had been hoped, so much was quickly accomplished in the rest of orientation that the schedule was pared down from four weeks to two and a half. Both students and faculty readily adapted to this change, viewing it as proof that education could be made flexible.

After completion of orientation, students enrolled in specific courses. All were required to register for the Humanities Colloquia, a three-unit, highly interdisciplinary course centered on the theme of "The Individual and Society." Credit was given for the established course, Humanities 1A, a decision which touched off another round of protests from the faculty. The Humanities Colloquia would be taught by the total Exploratory College staff, in conjunction with wide-ranging resource persons from the campus and community. Once a week students met

in a large group for a presentation. At another time, they would meet in "advisee groups", small discussion sessions led by a faculty advisor. The staff used advisee groups not only as a means for more fully exploring the current Colloquia topic, but also as a medium for advising students on educational or personal problems. The success of the Colloquia and the advisee groups was uneven. Some outstanding programs were presented. Most importantly, the Colloquia tied the Exploratory College together, producing through the common experience a true feeling of "community." On the other hand, the amount of time and work involved in coordinating the efforts of the six faculty members prevented the Colloquia from ever achieving its sizeable potential.

The regular course offerings strived to be informal, interdisciplinary, and flexible. Informality was the most easily attained goal. Some adjustment to the new roles of student and instructor was required, but, for the most part, both faculty and students enjoyed this non-traditional approach. A common student reaction was that the system was less-threatening, thereby encouraging them to achieve more.

Making courses truly interdisciplinary was more slippery. Apart from the Colloquia, instructors tried to achieve this by expanding the traditional scope of their courses to include related topics, or by occasionally combining their classes with that of another instructor when they were discussing a similar area.

To accomplish the latter, the program had to be made flexible. Rigid time schedules were abolished. Class meeting times were determined by the nature of their current activity and were announced the preceding week on a large calendar in the room. Through coordinating their schedules, instructors were thus able to join their classes. This flexibility also enabled classes to continue for longer time spans, permitting wide variations in their activities. Two severe difficulties soon became obvious. First, since most of the Exploratory staff

had courses in the regular program, which were locked into rigid schedules, their amount of "flexible" time was reduced. This problem was especially acute for the two physical education instructors who, besides having their own fixed schedule, found that the physical education facilities were free only during specified times. Secondly, students constantly had conflicts in their schedule when two of their non-related classes were held at the same time. These kinds of problems were typical of an "institution within an institution," and were never completely alleviated during the Exploratory College's first year.

The Exploratory Staff attempted to give students the major responsibility for their own education. A contractual system was employed to achieve this goal. Each student would design a contract, stating how he would complete the specified objectives for a particular course. He would also, during conference with the instructor, contract for a grade. Upon satisfactory completion of the contract he would be awarded a grade and credit for the course. Many examples of outstanding, creative work were achieved through this system. However, the staff soon realized that it was a little unrealistic to expect students, who had been conditioned to a passive role in the educational process, to suddenly become self-motivated learners. Corrective measures were later taken.

One aspect of the Exploratory program which was almost entirely the student's responsibility was the tremendously successful "freebies." These were "free" learning experiences for which the student received neither credits nor grades. Freebies usually consisted of an hour-long discussion or event covering any subject which interested the group. Freebies covered such diverse topics as religion, politics, sports, art, morality, and minority problems. Participating were outside speakers ranging from actor Jon Voight to State Senator George Moscone to pacifist David Harris. Another example of student self-direction was their arrangement for an off-campus expert to lead an eight-week freebie on the techniques of Yoga.

Students also began an unofficial Exploratory College newspaper, "Rimecx," with Lorin Warner who had recently joined the Exploratory staff, as faculty advisor. However, the newspaper soon encountered problems which were becoming common to many of the Exploratory College's attempts at innovation. First, since this effort was a departure from routine, the administration did not know how to handle it. Grandy decided that it could not be funded by the school since there was no provision in the budget for it and besides, in his words, "what if every department decided to print its own newspaper?" Next the journalism staff objected to the newspaper, arguing that the teaching of journalism was their responsibility. The Exploratory staff said that it was not engaging in the teaching of journalism, but were merely trying to provide an outlet for student expression. After several provocative issues, institutional pressure finally subsided.

Freebies were oftentimes attended by students and faculty from the regular campus, providing a welcome opportunity for the Exploratory College to reach out to the rest of the campus. Another success in the Exploratory College's campaign to end its isolation was achieved when Juric gave a well-received presentation at the FAJ retreat. However, the Exploratory staff and students increasingly felt isolated from the mainstream of campus activity. Part of this alienation was attributed to the facility used by the Exploratory College. The fourth-floor library room had many ideal aspects, but the fact that almost all of the Exploratory College's activities were held there decreased interaction with the regular campus. The faculty and students of the traditional Rio Hondo program became naturally suspicious of what, in one faculty member's words, "those kooks on the fourth floor were doing."

The Exploratory College had perhaps its greatest immediate impact on the traditional program in the area of physical education. Using the theme, "physical education for life," Beveridge and Bos developed a program in which students could

be exposed to several types of physical activities, such as backpacking and cycling, which could be easily engaged in throughout their life. This very popular system was soon adopted by the P.E. Department.

During the first module, both staff and students were pressured in their attempt to squeeze a traditionally 18-week course into a shorter span. Also, too many courses were being taught by the faculty, which decreased their effectiveness and increased scheduling conflicts. To ease these pressures, some courses were postponed until January when they would replace the proposed "Interim" module. This allowed a slower pace and improved accomplishments. Likewise, the Exploratory staff modified its projected spring schedule by eliminating the "Transitional" session and by extending the length of the modules to nine weeks. These moves gradually introduced more structure into the Exploratory College. While more structure reduced conflict and pressure to a large extent, it also diminished the opportunity for experimentation. Moreover, the exciting potentials of the "Interim" and "Transitional" sessions were lost.

Innovations by the Exploratory College were also limited by the Exploratory staff's uncertainty over their status. As a result of what was perceived as mixed messages coming from the Board and the administration, Juric and his staff were unsure about how much leeway they had been given. After a while, the Exploratory staff felt that their proposals would be either met with the complaint that such ideas were not consistent with the Exploratory College's original goals, or that their attempts were not "new" or "radical" enough. Moreover, the Exploratory College did not fit into the organizational framework of the institution. It was not considered a department and therefore had no separate slot in the budget. The director was not considered a department chairman and was thus denied participation in the Academic Council, where many important budgetary decisions were made. Although Garcia continued to reassert emphatically his support for the program, these factors led the Exploratory staff to believe that

it had no assurance of its future existence.

An attempt to alleviate these feelings was made by Obler, who, with the help of Joyce Smitheran, submitted a proposal for federal funding to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The application requested \$125,450 in H.E.W. funds over a two-year period, to be supplemented by \$156,872 from Rio Hondo. Aside from the salaries for the faculty and the director, the biggest expense in the proposal was \$25,875 for consultants in the first year. Some of these outside experts were to complete an extensive evaluation of the Exploratory College. Other consultants were to conduct a series of inservice training workshops for both the Exploratory faculty and those in the regular program. Also included in the budget was a provision for paying honorariums to guest speakers, a goal long unsuccessfully sought by the Exploratory staff. Although there were encouraging comments coming out of Washington, the application was finally rejected by H.E.W.

The Board refused to commit itself to future funding of the Exploratory College until it obtained a more complete evaluation of its performance. The preliminary plan for evaluation of the Exploratory College's first year was submitted by Juric to the Board on March 7, 1973. It envisioned three levels of evaluative input: Exploratory faculty and students, a faculty committee from the regular program, and an analysis by Cohen, which was later rescheduled for the next year.

Juric also included in his report a list of goals and objectives (see attachment #II) as was now required by the new Rio Hondo evaluation policy. This marked another stage in the development of the Exploratory College's aims. While it did restate two of the original goals (i.e., relating the curriculum to the community and providing students with career direction), its main emphasis was now clearly the establishment of an alternative educational system. Central to this program was innovative instruction, interdisciplinary courses, new

concepts of student and faculty roles, self-directed learning, and the creation of the feeling of "community" within the Exploratory College.

The first-year evaluation was presented to the Board on August 6. Garcia prefaced the report by noting:

When it was decided several years ago to create an experimental college within Rio Hondo College, it was agreed and understood that by the very nature of its founding charter the Exploratory College would be flexible and fluid in concept and nature. Such an institution is, by its very nature, very unlikely to be predictable. The first year of operation of the college, completed this June, was viewed as one in which more mistakes were likely to be made than gains.

Garcia continued with a list of issues that needed to be addressed during the Exploratory College's second year:

1. We need to identify those elements of curriculum structure and instructional organization that seem to have been the most promising in the Exploratory College in its initial year. Those techniques and structures which appear to be most effective need to be identified and promulgated in other areas of the college.
2. We must identify procedures and scheduling techniques which will enable a larger number of the members of the faculty to be involved in varying degrees of intensity in the Exploratory College.
3. It is generally agreed that more attention needs to be devoted to developing participation by the Exploratory College student in various aspects of community services and more thorough exploration of career alternatives. These were two key concepts in the formation of the Exploratory College and need to receive further attention.
4. It should be possible even though spontaneity is a primary value of the Exploratory College, to devise a means for more effective advance planning in the Exploratory College.
5. To the degree possible, we need to evaluate the singular impact of the Exploratory College on its students as distinguished from the impact the traditional college might have on the same students. Stated another way, the question is: Is it possible to discern any unique contribution that the Exploratory College, qua Exploratory College, has made to Rio Hondo College.

The first year of the Exploratory College has been a productive and interesting one as the evaluations indicate and we are encouraged to believe that further growth and development will occur during its subsequent years of operation.

Overall, the Exploratory College staff's self-evaluations were frank and comprehensive. The staff generally felt that it was very successful in the attainment of better student-faculty relationships and in the creation of interdisciplinary courses. They believed that they were moderately successful in establishing a flexible schedule and in the development of self-directed students. The strongest self-criticism was on the failure to relate learning to the community and the development of student career objectives. Failures of the Exploratory program were blamed on their own mistakes, the enormous pressure of time, administrative obstacles, institutional inertia, and the students' lack of initiative. While the Exploratory staff believed that a really valid evaluation could only come later, it generally felt that the experiment had been a success at that point.

Student evaluations were obtained by questionnaires (see attachment #III) and through a series of informal discussions. Students were very enthusiastic about the program, although it should be remembered that the survey was taken by those students who had successfully adapted to the Exploratory College and not by those who had dropped out. The greatest accomplishment, from the students' viewpoint, was that the program helped them become more self-directed. Also the students thought that the Exploratory College enabled them to see the interrelatedness of different disciplines. The survey showed that the students' perception of the drawbacks of the Exploratory College were, for the most part, in agreement with the criticisms of the Exploratory faculty.

Further input to the evaluation was obtained from a faculty committee appointed by the Academic Senate. Its members were Stan Carroll (social science), Jack Hole (chemistry), Robert Kopfstein (communications), John Ogborn (automotive

technology), and Dick Young (physical education). The committee held several meetings with Exploratory faculty and students, interviewed numerous individuals from the regular program, and visited several Exploratory College classes. The committee was favorably impressed that the Exploratory College was making progress toward its goals. Committee members were especially pleased with the degree of student-faculty rapport in the Exploratory College. They were also somewhat surprised by the extent of learning taking place in the non-traditional atmosphere. On the negative side, the committee complained that there was poor communication between the Exploratory College and the rest of the campus.

An overview of the program, then, shows that the evolution of the program has caused it to change somewhat from the original concepts, but that it is fulfilling the valuable function of offering alternative styles of education. Upon reviewing histories of other experimental colleges, it can be seen that most of them have gone through a similar evolution with many of the same problems, among them not communicating well enough with the rest of the faculty. The Exploratory Staff is presently working on ways to solve this problem.

EXPLORATORY COLLEGE
Schedule 1972-73

EXPLORING THE DYNAMICS OF BEING

WEEK	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36
	Orientation				HUMANITIES COLLOQUIA The Individual & Society				INTERIM Evaluation				HUMANITIES COLLOQUIA The Environment: Physical & Cultural				TRANSITIONAL Evaluation																			
	Group				CONTRACT 1				I				CONTRACT 4				I																			
	Seminars				CONTRACT 2				N				CONTRACT 5				N																			
					CONTRACT 3				D				CONTRACT 3				D																			
									S								S																			
									T								T																			
									U								U																			
									D								D																			
									Y								Y																			
									N								N																			
									T								T																			

	1st Semester	program	units	2nd Semester	program	units
Orientation	- Psychology 20		2	Humanities Colloquia - Humanities 1B		3
Humanities Colloquia	- Humanities 1A		3	Contract 4 & 5	- General Education	4 - 6
Contract 1 & 2	- General Education		4 - 6	Contract 6 & 7	- General Education	4 - 6
Contract 3	- Physical Education		1	Contract 3	- Physical Education	1
Interim	- Independent Study		0 - 3	Transitional	- Independent Study	0 - 3
Work Experience	- General Education		0 - 4	Work Experience	- General Education	0 - 4
			(Minimum - Maximum Credit) 10 - 19			
			(Minimum - Maximum Credit) 12 - 23			

March 7, 1973

EXPLORATORY COLLEGE GOALS AND OBJECTIVESPHILOSOPHICAL PREMISE

The purpose of the Exploratory College is not separate from the traditional college, but is rather an alternative center for exploring new ways of learning within the college community. By being a smaller, primarily interdisciplinary nucleus, our goals reflect the need for modes of experience that are more commensurate with individual and group goals than traditionally possible.

GOALS

- I. The Rio Hondo campus and community will have a center for exploring new ways of learning for students and faculty.

Objectives

1. Students and faculty will experience a sense of community.
 2. Any member of the college faculty will have the opportunity to present a new course or topic.
 3. Students and faculty will be given the opportunity to share the responsibility for curriculum development.
 4. Students and faculty will share information and research of mutual interest.
 5. A balance will be achieved between the teacher and teaching as well as between the learner and learning.
 6. Students and faculty will be able to meet on an informal basis.
 7. The Exploratory College will provide access to resource people within and without the general college community.
 8. Alternative methods of presenting established courses will be tried out.
 9. New ways for students and faculty to learn will be explored.
 10. Knowledge gained in the Exploratory College about teaching techniques, learning, organization, etc., will be shared with the general college community.
 11. Students and faculty will be afforded reasonable access to book and non-book materials, equipment and facilities.
 12. The physical arrangement of the primary facility will depict a center.
- II. The Exploratory College provides students with an opportunity to experience a relaxed learning setting with flexible scheduling.

Objectives

1. Students and faculty will be able to participate in any discussion group or class on a drop-in basis as they deem appropriate.
2. The physical arrangements in a classroom will vary with the learning method that is being employed.
3. Student-faculty rapport will be such that learning is perceived as a mutual responsibility and thus non-threatening.
4. Assignments, projects and research leading to expected learning outcomes will be based upon individual interests, needs and goals.
5. Learning, completion of courses and projects will proceed in accordance with individual interests and ability rather than within some predetermined time frame.

Exploratory College Goals and Objectives
Page 2

6. Exploration in its various contexts will take less time than is generally the case.
7. Class meetings and the presentation of topics will be varied from week to week as desired learning outcomes warrant.
8. Schedules will vary according to the accessibility of resource persons within and without the Exploratory College.
9. Students and faculty will learn to adapt to change and uncertainty.

III. Exploratory College students and faculty receive guidance and direction in determining their personal and professional goals.

Objectives

1. The Exploratory College will be open to all students that feel they can profit from the experience and as such they will be a microcosm of the Rio Hondo Student Body.
2. Each student will be afforded the opportunity to receive individual guidance and counseling to reach his professional and personal goals.
3. Students and faculty will identify and increase their awareness of personal goals.
4. The student's understanding of his potential will be improved through involvement in testing as needed.
5. Students will be able to identify professional alternatives as well as what will be required of them to enter such occupations.
6. The process of equipping students with the skills needed to reach their personal and professional goals will be initiated.
7. Students and faculty will be exposed to persons who are employed in various occupations.
8. The student's desire to achieve his personal and professional goals will serve as the primary motivation for learning.
9. Faculty will continue their own professional growth.

IV. In the Exploratory College students and faculty experience opportunities that increase their self-awareness and self-worth.

Objectives

1. Students and faculty will gain the ability to assess their own strengths and weaknesses.
2. The students' strengths will be reinforced and they will learn to value their own ideas.
3. Students will acquire a sense of self-discipline.
4. Students helping students to learn will be encouraged and common to the Exploratory College.
5. Students and faculty will make use of the beauty of the community.

Exploratory College Goals and Objectives
Page 3

- V. The Exploratory College provides an opportunity for students and faculty to apperceive the interrelatedness of the disciplines. Thus, education in the Exploratory College unifies learning and experience; past, present and future; romance and reality; mind and body; work, play and contemplation.

Objectives

1. Students will enroll in a common core course in the humanities that demonstrates the interrelatedness of disciplines.
2. Team and interdisciplinary instruction will be common in the Exploratory College.
3. Seminars, freebees and discussion groups in general will be based upon the combined background of instructors.
4. Faculty and students will have the ability to combine classes or regroup themselves to explore given topics as needed to demonstrate discipline interrelatedness.
5. Student learning will be facilitated through goals and objectives that clearly demonstrate the interrelatedness of disciplines.
6. Students will be encouraged to undertake projects that unify two or more fields.
7. The Exploratory College will emphasize an interdisciplinary approach to bibliographies, readings and research.
8. Students and faculty will explore a variety of disciplines and achieve the skills necessary for their goals.

- VI. Students and faculty in the Exploratory College have an opportunity to become involved in the community as an integral part of the learning environment.

Objectives

1. The Exploratory College will provide students with the opportunity to use the community as a resource for learning.
2. Students will be encouraged to become involved in community voluntary activities.
3. Students will have the opportunity to explore occupational goals in the community.
4. Students and faculty will identify problems of the community and develop means that might be employed to help resolve such problems.
5. Students will have the opportunity to undertake projects which require involvement in the community.
6. In the Exploratory College involvement in the learning process will be a primary motivation for learning.

- VII. Exploratory College students receive standard college credit within a non-threatening grading system.

Objectives

1. Exploratory College courses will be readily accepted in higher education.

Exploratory College Goals and Objectives
Page 4

2. Students will be given the right to fail without penalty.
3. The incentive for individual success will be individual growth and not grades.
4. Attainment will be based upon individual achievement rather than a group norm.
5. Students will accept the responsibility for assisting faculty to determine their own grades.

VIII. Exploratory College students and faculty develop personal values and attitudes through exposure to the values and attitudes of ours and other cultures.

Objectives

1. The Exploratory College experience will reflect the rapidity of change in a modern society.
2. As a natural phenomenon curiosity will be encouraged.
3. Students and faculty will be able to identify, distinguish between and explain differences in values and attitudes.
4. Students and faculty will be able to demonstrate the information and insight they have gained about the values of other people and societies.
5. Students and faculty will demonstrate a commitment to learning as a continuing process.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

FEB 20 1976

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES

EXPLORATORY COLLEGE
General Student Evaluation

1. Did you enjoy your experiences in the Exploratory College?
Usually 67 Often 26 Occasionally 7 Rarely 0
2. Did you feel that the knowledge and skills acquired here were adequate?
Usually 45 Often 46 Occasionally 7 Rarely 2
3. Did you experience a continuing sense of community within the group?
Usually 46 Often 24 Occasionally 28 Rarely 2
4. Were you able to function comfortably within the flexible scheduling?
Usually 35 Often 38 Occasionally 23 Rarely 4
5. Did your experiences here help you to become more self directed?
Usually 63 Often 20 Occasionally 15 Rarely 2
6. Did you have sufficient direction toward a realistic assessment of your abilities?
Usually 24 Often 39 Occasionally 26 Rarely 11
7. Through projects, study, and presentations, did you recognize the interrelatedness of different subject areas?
Usually 63 Often 27 Occasionally 7 Rarely 3
8. Did you find Humanities Colloquia unified, interesting, and worthwhile?
Usually 43 Often 26 Occasionally 24 Rarely 7
9. Was the balance between structure and freedom adequate for your needs?
Usually 41 Often 36 Occasionally 12 Rarely 11
10. Did your experiences in the Exploratory College help you come closer to making a career choice?
Usually 24 Often 8 Occasionally 20 Rarely 48
11. Were you able to relate and/or use your experiences in the Exploratory College to the district community?
Usually 29 Often 19 Occasionally 38 Rarely 14